

University of Plymouth

PEARL

<https://pearl.plymouth.ac.uk>

Faculty of Science and Engineering

School of Biological and Marine Sciences

2020-05-27

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY B

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Universal metabolic constraints shape the evolutionary ecology of diving in animals.

Journal:	<i>Proceedings B</i>
Manuscript ID	RSPB-2020-0488.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Verberk, Wilco; Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, Animal Ecology and Physiology Calosi, Piero; Université du Québec à Rimouski Brischoux, Francois; Université de La Rochelle, Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chizé Spicer, John; University of Plymouth Faculty of Science and Engineering, Garland, Jr., Theodore; University of California Riverside Bilton, David; Plymouth University, Marine Biology and Ecology Research Centre
Subject:	Ecology < BIOLOGY, Evolution < BIOLOGY, Physiology < BIOLOGY
Keywords:	allometry, ectothermy, endothermy, evolutionary physiology, paleophysiology, mass scaling
Proceedings B category:	Ecology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Author-supplied statements

Relevant information will appear here if provided.

Ethics

Does your article include research that required ethical approval or permits?:

This article does not present research with ethical considerations

Statement (if applicable):

CUST_IF_YES_ETHICS :No data available.

Data

It is a condition of publication that data, code and materials supporting your paper are made publicly available. Does your paper present new data?:

Yes

Statement (if applicable):

We have made our data file publically available in Dryad. Note that this database in Dryad is private during for the duration of the article's peer review period. I have provided the pre-release preview and the csv file for the reviewers as supplementary files.

Conflict of interest

I/We declare we have no competing interests

Statement (if applicable):

CUST_STATE_CONFLICT :No data available.

Authors' contributions

This paper has multiple authors and our individual contributions were as below

Statement (if applicable):

P.C. proposed the initial idea and together with D.T.B, J.I.S. and W.C.E.P.V. contributed to its development. F.B., P.C., and W.C.E.P.V. collated the data. W.C.E.P.V. led the data analysis with input from T.G. All authors discussed the results, and substantially contributed to the writing.

**Title: Universal metabolic constraints shape the evolutionary ecology of diving
in animals**

Authors: Wilco C.E.P. Verberk^{1,2}, Piero Calosi^{2,3}, François Brischoux⁴, John I. Spicer²,
Theodore Garland, Jr.⁵, David T. Bilton^{2,6}

Affiliations:

¹ Department of Animal Ecology and Ecophysiology, Radboud University, P.O. Box 9010,
6500 GL Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

² Marine Biology and Ecology Research Centre, School of Biological and Marine Sciences,
University of Plymouth, Drake Circus, Plymouth PL4 8AA, United Kingdom.

³ Département de Biologie, Chimie et Géographie, Université du Québec à Rimouski, 300
Allée des Ursulines, Rimouski, G5L 3A1, Québec, Canada.

⁴ Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chizé, UMR 7372 CNRS-La Rochelle Université, 79360
Villiers en Bois, France.

⁵ Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology, University of California,
Riverside, CA 92521, USA.

⁶ Department of Zoology, University of Johannesburg, PO Box 524, Auckland Park, 2006
Johannesburg, South Africa.

*** Corresponding author:** Wilco Verberk. Radboud University, P.O. Box 9010, 6500 GL
Nijmegen, the Netherlands. Tel.: +31(0)243653155. E-mail: wilco@aquaticecology.nl

Abstract:

Diving as a lifestyle has evolved on multiple occasions when air-breathing terrestrial animals invaded the aquatic realm, and diving performance shapes the ecology and behaviour of all air-breathing aquatic taxa, from small insects to great whales. Using the largest dataset yet assembled, we show that maximum dive duration increases predictably with body mass in both ectotherms and endotherms. Compared to endotherms, ectotherms can remain submerged for longer, but the mass scaling relationship for dive duration is much steeper in endotherms than in ectotherms. These differences in diving allometry can be fully explained by inherent differences between the two groups in their metabolic rate and how metabolism scales with body mass and temperature. We therefore suggest that similar constraints on oxygen storage and usage have shaped the evolutionary ecology of diving in all air-breathing animals, irrespective of their evolutionary history and metabolic mode. The steeper scaling relationship between body mass and dive duration in endotherms not only helps explain why the largest extant vertebrate divers are endothermic rather than ectothermic, but also fits well with the emerging consensus that large extinct tetrapod divers (e.g. plesiosaurs, ichthyosaurs and mosasaurs) were endothermic.

One Sentence Summary:

Constraints on oxygen storage and usage have shaped the ecology of all air-breathing divers, from insects to whales.

Keywords:

allometry, ectothermy, endothermy, evolutionary physiology, palaeophysiology, scaling.

Introduction

Diving behaviour has evolved independently many times in air-breathing animals as diverse as insects, amphibians, turtles, crocodiles, snakes, birds and mammals¹⁻⁶, as well as a number of extinct reptile lineages⁷. The behaviour and ecology of these air-breathers depend on their ability to remain submerged^{8,9}. All diving animals face the same basic challenges, and natural selection generally should act to maximise dive duration within the constraints of an organism's morphology and physiology. Body mass has an overriding influence on maximum dive duration^{10,11} and, according to the *Oxygen Store/Usage Hypothesis*^{1,10,12}, larger-bodied species should be better at 'holding their breath', because oxygen stores scale approximately isometrically (m^1) with body mass, whereas oxygen requirements (metabolic rates) scale with negative allometry ($m^{<1}$). Owing to their lower mass-specific metabolic rates, large divers can store more oxygen relative to the rate at which they consume it. Support for this hypothesis is particularly strong for endotherms^{10,13}, although one recent study suggests it may also apply to ectotherms, albeit based on data limited to vertebrates¹². A high metabolic rate is the main source of heat in endotherms, and their elevated metabolic rates whilst at rest enable them to maintain a relatively-high and more-or-less constant internal temperature (homeothermy)¹⁴⁻¹⁶. By this definition, endothermy in modern faunas is restricted to birds and mammals, although we acknowledge that some large ectotherms can attain and maintain relatively constant body temperatures (i.e. "gigantothermy" and "inertial homeothermy", such as the leatherback turtle *Dermochelys coriacea*).

Here we examine how metabolic constraints govern limits to diving performance across air-breathing taxa as different as small insects and large cetaceans within a phylogenetic framework and consider the implications for our understanding of diving in both extant and

67 extinct animals. To date, formal tests of the *Oxygen Store/Usage Hypothesis* in ectotherms have
68 been hampered by the lack of empirical data for small-bodied taxa¹¹. However, recent works^{6,17}
69 have generated data on the diving behaviour of 26 species of insects (see Fig. 1), greatly
70 broadening the phylogenetic representation and, most importantly, extending the body mass
71 range of ectotherms available for analysis. In fact, these new data enable the comparative study
72 of ectothermic animals ranging over approximately eight orders of magnitude in body mass,
73 from small diving beetles (*Deronectes bicostatus* approx. 5.5 mg¹⁷) to large sea turtles
74 (*Dermochelys coriacea* > 300 Kg¹⁸). Drawing on the largest dataset compiled to date on dive
75 duration and body mass in both ectotherm and endotherm divers, we test whether the *Oxygen*
76 *Store/Usage Hypothesis* applies to all diving animals, irrespective of their evolutionary origin
77 and metabolic mode. Specifically, we compiled and analysed 1,792 records for 286 species,
78 including 62 ectotherms and 224 endotherms. This represents an increases of 78%, 121% and
79 10% for total number of records, ectotherm species, and endotherm species, respectively,
80 compared to the last update¹² (Fig. S1A). To do so, we quantify the body mass dependence of
81 maximum dive duration in both ectotherm and endotherm divers, and compare empirical scaling
82 relationships of dive duration with the known mass dependency of metabolic rate (oxygen
83 consumption) in the two groups (see Methods for more details on selection of appropriate scaling
84 coefficients). Metabolic rate increases with body mass, but less strongly in endotherms than
85 ectotherms, as reflected in scaling exponents for resting metabolic rate being lower for
86 endotherms than ectotherms, both on empirical and theoretical grounds: see ref^{19,20,21}, Methods
87 and supplementary analyses. Consequently, if the *Oxygen Store/Usage Hypothesis* holds true,
88 scaling exponents for maximum dive duration should be smaller in ectotherms than endotherms,
89 and this difference should be attributable to differences in metabolic scaling between the two

groups²². Metabolic rate also increases with temperature and therefore we also included body temperature (where available) or water temperature in our analyses. Our working assumption is that diving in both ectotherms and endotherms is governed by the same general principles, meaning that differences in maximum dive duration should be mirrored by differences in metabolic rate, related to differences in body mass and temperature. As a result, the lower oxygen requirements of ectotherms should enable them to remain submerged for longer than similarly sized endotherms¹¹, whereas the steeper metabolic scaling in ectotherms¹⁹ should translate to smaller gains in diving performance with increasing body mass.

Results

Maximum dive duration varied from less than a minute in several birds to greater than 1 h in several turtle species and some cetaceans. Much of the variation in maximum dive duration can be accounted for by metabolic mode (endothermy vs. ectothermy), body mass, and temperature (Table 1). The model best fitting the data employed phylogenetic generalized least squares (PGLS) based on a time-calibrated phylogenetic tree that was rescaled by Grafen's rho ($\rho = 0.273$). This model significantly outperformed a PGLS using a star phylogeny ($\lambda = 0$; $\Delta\text{AIC} = 91.1$) and a PGLS with a lambda close to 1 ($\lambda = 0.95$; $\Delta\text{AIC} = 13.8$). Dive duration increased with body mass in both ectotherms and endotherms (Fig. 2A, $P < 0.021$), but scaling exponents differed significantly, with dive duration increasing more steeply with body mass in endotherms (body mass x metabolic mode interaction, $P = 0.022$). As an example, maximum dive duration increased almost 11-fold with a 1,000-fold increase in body mass in endotherms, but only around 3-fold in ectotherms. In order to test whether these differences in diving allometry can be explained from known differences in metabolic scaling between ectotherms and endotherms, we

regressed dive duration against an index of oxygen storage capacity, instead of body mass. This index accounts for mass-related differences in oxygen usage and storage (see Methods). When substituting body mass for this index, we no longer found that dive duration scaled differently between ectotherms and endotherms (i.e. the interaction between the Oxygen index and Metabolic mode was non-significant; $P = 0.91$), the model without the interaction performing better ($\Delta AIC = 2.1$; Table 1; Fig. 2B). Very similar results were obtained here when using a time-calibrated phylogeny where lambda was estimated ($\lambda = 0.95$) or a star phylogeny ($\lambda = 0$) (see Table 1).

We also found differences in intercepts (elevations) between ectotherms and endotherms; dive duration being greater in ectotherms than endotherms of comparable body mass (Fig. 2A, Table 1). As differences in mass scaling complicate comparisons of intercepts, we based our exploration on the best fitting model employing the index of oxygen storage capacity (Fig. 2B; model C in Table 1), meaning that such differences in scaling were accounted for. Based on that model, dive duration in ectotherms was about an order of magnitude longer than in endotherms with a comparable oxygen storage capacity. Finally, in all models, we found that dive duration was significantly affected by differences in temperature across species (Table 1, Fig. 2C). In all cases the effect of the temperature correction factor was negative, meaning that the greater rate of oxygen consumption associated with elevated temperatures (see Fig. S3) resulted in a shorter dive duration. Since temperature exponentially increases metabolic rate, the effect of temperature is curvilinear (Fig. 2C) and the fitted value for the temperature correction factor in the model (-0.864 ± 0.282) was indeed close to the expected value of -1, where any increase in oxygen demand would reduce dive duration by the same factor.

Discussion

Our work provides an unprecedented analysis of the physiological and evolutionary ecology of diving behaviour from a metabolic perspective with far-reaching implications. We reveal clear differences in the mass scaling of maximum dive duration between ectotherms and endotherms and show that these different scaling relationships can be reconciled from known differences in the mass scaling of metabolic rates between ectotherms and endotherms as predicted from the *Oxygen Store/Usage Hypothesis*^{1,10,22}. As with endotherms, the diving performance of ectotherms has not evolved independently of body mass¹¹, and the same basic physiological principles have apparently shaped the evolutionary ecology of diving in all animals, from small diving beetles to great whales^{11,12,17,23}.

In the past, the relative paucity of data for ectotherm divers, has prevented rigorous testing of the *Oxygen Store/Usage Hypothesis* across all diving animals. Our analyses demonstrate that previous uncertainty regarding the scaling of dive duration with body mass in ectotherms was a result of the lack of information on small ectotherm divers, and not because ectotherms are more phylogenetically diverse than endotherms, or because they display greater metabolic variation¹¹. In fact, the vertical scatter around the allometric relationships is similar for ectotherms and endotherms. Such scatter shows that there is variation in diving capacity between species of similar size or phylogeny, highlighting that in particular lineages and species, body mass and oxygen storage capacity may be uncoupled to some extent (Fig. 2A; see also^{11,13}). The evolution of particular physiological adaptations may often explain such uncoupling. For example, the elevated hematocrit level found in marine snakes (Hydrophiinae) facilitates increased aerobic dive duration⁴. Many diving mammals have evolved myoglobins with elevated net surface charge, which facilitates higher intramuscular concentrations²⁴. Conversely, lunge-

feeding in balaenopterid rorquals is energetically costly and the evolution of lunge-feeding appears to have compromised their diving capacities²⁵. Given the allometry of diving we report here, such adaptations appear to be modulations superimposed upon the universal constraints of size-dependent oxygen storage and utilisation.

Greater gains in dive capacity with body mass are predicted under the *Oxygen Store/Usage Hypothesis* for endotherms, since their mass-specific rates of oxygen consumption decline more with increasing body mass compared to ectotherms¹, something which is supported by empirical studies showing that scaling exponents for resting metabolic rate are lower for endotherms than ectotherms^{19,20}. The mass-related differences between the dive duration of ectotherms and endotherms reported here (Fig. 2A) are fully mirrored by mass-related differences in their metabolic rates; not just in slopes, but also intercepts (Fig. 2B). Differences in slopes disappeared when we accounted for differences in oxygen storage relative to usage, using the index of oxygen storage capacity. The modelled slope for the oxygen index is close to 1, indicating a proportional relationship (Fig. 2B; Table 1), which makes sense as animals should gain dive capacity in proportion to their capacity to store oxygen, once differences in oxygen demand are accounted for. A sensitivity analysis, employing different scaling exponents for ectotherm and endotherm metabolic rates (derived from a reanalysis of the largest database available on these rates - see supplementary materials) yielded similar results (see Table S1). Our demonstration of differences between ectotherms and endotherms in the mass scaling of dive duration contrasts with previous analyses, limited to vertebrates¹², that did not find such differences. The greater range of animal body sizes in our study, including larger (leatherback turtles) and smaller (dytiscid beetles) ectotherms, likely enabled us to detect these differences in scaling. The maximum dive duration of endotherms and ectotherms converged at large body

sizes, whereas there was no difference in scaling exponents when comparing endotherms and ectotherms on the basis of index of oxygen storage capacity (Table 1, model B). Considering differences in intercepts, for a given oxygen index, ectothermic divers such as reptiles can remain submerged for much longer than their endothermic counterparts¹¹. Such greater dive duration in ectotherms is partly related to their lower body temperature and partly to their metabolic mode; effects of the latter accounting for a 10-fold difference in dive time (Model C, Table 1). This is in line with the observation that absolute metabolic rates are generally around an order of magnitude lower in ectotherms compared to endotherms, when expressed at a common temperature²⁶⁻²⁸ - see also supplementary analysis. Although the largest ectotherms approach the same dive duration as similarly sized endotherms, they will have smaller lower oxygen consumption rates and concomitantly smaller oxygen stores. Oxygen stores scale approximately isometrically with body mass, but the differences in metabolic scaling results in a shallower mass scaling of dive duration in ectotherms, meaning that the benefits of ectothermy for diving duration are reduced at large body sizes.

Since temperature increases metabolic rate, higher temperatures result in lower dive durations and as temperature has an exponential effect, stronger reductions are both expected and observed towards higher body temperatures in endotherms (Fig. 2C). This non-linearity was encapsulated by our temperature correction factor, which expresses the effect temperature has on oxygen demand, relative to a reference temperature (see Fig. S3). As such, it represents a multiplication factor for metabolism. According to the *Oxygen Store/Usage Hypothesis*, any temperature-driven increase in oxygen demand should translate to an equivalent reduction in dive duration. As dive duration on a log₁₀ scale also represents a multiplication factor, the hypothesis will be supported if the model has a fitted value of -1, which closely matches the

value observed in our analyses (Table 1). In summary, the values estimated for intercepts and slopes indicate that dive duration increases proportionally with oxygen storage capacity (as shown by the index of oxygen storage capacity) and that it decreases proportionally with temperature-driven increases in oxygen demand (as shown by the temperature correction factor). A metabolic perspective on dive duration is therefore further supported by the fitted values for both thermal dependence and scaling of metabolism.

Air contains 20-30x more oxygen than water, is less viscous and less dense and consequently rates of oxygen diffusion are $\sim 300,000$ times faster in air than in water^{29,30}. Large animals are therefore much better able to meet their metabolic demands by breathing air rather than obtaining oxygen from water, which could partly explain why the largest aquatic animals to have evolved are air-breathing divers rather than fishes³¹. Today, the largest diving animals are all true endotherms (Cetacea). Although endothermy in itself is not a prerequisite to be a good diver, it may have facilitated the evolution of large body size. Recent studies of bone and soft tissue anatomy^{7, 32-34}, as well as the oxygen isotope composition of tooth phosphate^{35,36}, suggest that ichthyosaurs, plesiosaurs and mososaurs, and perhaps some other extinct marine reptile groups, were also truly endothermic. As well as allowing increased aerobic capacity^{14,37}, endothermy facilitates the colonisation of a wide range of marine habitats, including relatively cold seas, known to have been occupied by such marine reptiles^{35,38}. Although the fossil record of these taxa is punctuated by extinction events which reduce morphological diversity (e.g. ref³⁹), all three groups contain species that achieved very large body sizes, in some cases comparable to some of the largest modern cetaceans⁴⁰, and show evidence of increases in body size with time^{39,41,42}. Because the scaling exponents for metabolic rate are lower for endotherms when compared to ectotherms, net gains in dive duration *per* unit mass increase are greater in

228 endothermic animals. Although many other factors clearly influence body size, this extra
229 advantage of being large may, at least in part, have facilitated the evolution of large body size in
230 both extinct and extant tetrapod divers.

231 At the macroevolutionary level, once differences in metabolic rate are accounted for, both
232 endothermic and ectothermic animals converge on the same allometric relationship when
233 considering how long they can hold their breath. This pattern suggests that the adaptive
234 significance of body size and metabolism for dive duration is largely independent of
235 evolutionary history. Viewed through the lens of the *Oxygen Store/Usage Hypothesis*, body mass
236 and temperature affect dive duration in a similar manner in taxa as evolutionarily distant as
237 insects, reptiles, birds and mammals. Consequently, the same general physical and physiological
238 principles have shaped the evolution of diving in all animal groups, both ancient and modern,
239 constituting a new fundamental principle for evolutionary physiology^{43,44}.

241 **Materials and Methods**

242 *Data collection and selection*

243 Data on diving performance and body mass of ectotherms and endotherms were collated
244 from the published literature. We have drawn on a previously published dataset, initially
245 constructed by Schreer and Kovacs³ and subsequently updated by Halsey *et al.*¹⁰, Brischoux *et*
246 *al.*¹¹ and Hayward *et al.*¹². We used the "penguiness book"⁴⁵ to locate most of the studies used.
247 We rechecked all records and added data from the primary literature to generate the most
248 comprehensive dataset on dive duration to date, comprising 1,792 records for 286 species of
249 which 62 were ectotherms and 224 endotherms (Fig. S1A).

We focused on maximum dive duration as a proxy for the evolutionary limit to dive capacity in a given species. Preliminary analyses showed that maximum dive duration co-varied closely with mean dive duration (Fig. S2A), even after accounting for differences in body mass and temperature (Fig. S2B). For species with multiple data entries for maximum dive duration, we selected the entry closest to the 95th percentile, in an attempt to account for variation in sample size across species⁴⁶. For species with many records, the absolute longest dive recorded may also sometimes represent an extreme event, such as an animal being disoriented. Taking the 95th percentile will help to minimise the influence of such events. Temperature strongly affects metabolic rate in ectotherms²⁶, see also supplementary analysis, and hence also affects dive duration (e.g. 6,17,47,48). Selection of the data entry closest to the 95th percentile for a given species was therefore based on dive duration expressed at a common mean temperature, by correcting dive duration with a (within-species) temperature correction factor:

$$\text{Temperature correction factor} = e^{\frac{-Ea}{k} * (1/_{Temperature} - 1/_{Mean temperature})}$$

where Ea is the activation energy in eV and k is the Boltzmann constant in eV·K⁻¹ and $Temperature$ is expressed in Kelvin. Here we used an Ea of 0.68 eV, which roughly equates to a Q_{10} of 2.4, as is typically found in intraspecific comparisons (see Supplementary Materials). Temperature values refer to body temperature where available (all endotherms and some ectotherms) and otherwise to water temperature (most ectotherms). The common mean temperature represented the mean across all species in the database (33°C); at this mean temperature the temperature correction factor = 1. By selecting the data entry of the individual whose dive duration was closest to the 95th percentile (see above), we assembled data on body

mass, temperature, and maximum dive duration for the 226 species for which we had data on maximum dive duration and these data were used in further analyses (see Fig. S1B). We excluded the very high submergence times ($>30,000$ min) reported for the Fitzroy River turtle, *Rheodytes leukops*, since these represent brumation events rather than dives. During brumation metabolic rates are greatly reduced and *R. leukops* survives by aquatic respiration across the surface of the cloacal bursae⁴⁹.

Data analyses

We explored the effect of body mass on dive duration using linear versions of phylogenetic generalized least squares (PGLS) models. These models were used to test whether the mass scaling of diving performance differed between ectotherms and endotherms, both in terms of intercept, which would indicate absolute differences in dive capacity, and slope, which would indicate differences in the mass dependence of diving performance. Both body mass and dive duration were \log_{10} -transformed prior to analyses. In each model we tested for differences in the scaling exponent between ectotherms and endotherms by including an interaction term of body mass x metabolic mode (i.e. ectotherm or endotherm). As temperature is known to affect dive duration (see above), some variation in dive duration across species is likely attributable to differences in body temperature. Based on the *Oxygen Store/Usage Hypothesis*, such thermal effects should be mediated through the effect temperature has on metabolic rate. To capture the non-linear effect of temperature on metabolism, we calculated a temperature correction factor using the equation above, rather than including temperature directly. Preliminary analyses confirmed that models which employed this correction factor were better supported than those using raw temperatures. Since we are making across-species comparisons here, we employed the

activation energy reported for interspecific comparisons (i.e. $Ea = 0.43\text{eV}$ ref⁵⁰; Fig. S3), which roughly corresponds to a Q_{10} of 1.7. Although it is well established that thermal activation energies differ when making comparisons across or within species, we also ran sensitivity analyses to determine whether our conclusions were robust to different values for activation energy. These analyses yielded similar results for both 25% lower and 25% higher activation energies (see Table S2). As expected, fitted values for temperature differed slightly, but in all cases, temperature significantly affected dive duration and in all cases we found a clear difference in dive allometry between ectotherms and endotherms. Preliminary analyses also explored whether ectotherms and endotherms differed in the thermal sensitivity of their dive durations, by including an interaction between metabolic mode and the temperature correction factor. However, such models were uninformative, as endotherms and ectotherms differed both with respect to body mass and body temperature, making it impossible to disentangle the relative importance of these parameters when both are allowed to vary. Birds, with their relatively low dive durations, are both smaller and warmer compared to mammals. Similarly, endotherms are both larger and warmer than ectotherms. Due to this covariation between body size and body temperature across clades, we calculated the thermal effect on metabolism using the same value across all species (see Fig S3), rather than fitting them separately in the models. Studies that investigate the thermal sensitivity of metabolic rate in ectotherms suggest that although species differ, a single value for activation energy can approximate the thermal sensitivity in large-scale comparisons²³, including in the context of diving¹².

Under the *Oxygen Store/Usage Hypothesis*, an isometric increase in oxygen stores (M^1) and a suballometric increase in metabolism (M^β , with $\beta < 1$) generate an increase in oxygen storage capacity relative to metabolic demand with increasing body mass; a similar argument is

used to predict the positive scaling of fasting endurance with body mass⁵¹. In order to account for such mass related differences in metabolism, and test whether these differences in diving allometry can be explained from known differences in metabolic scaling between ectotherms and endotherms, we regressed dive duration against an index of oxygen storage capacity, instead of body mass. This index of oxygen storage capacity is defined as:

$$\text{O}_2 \text{ index} = M^{1-\beta}$$

where β is the metabolic scaling exponent. Empirical evidence indicates that the metabolic scaling exponent differs between endotherms and ectotherms^{19,20}, which Glazier²¹ explained with his ‘metabolic-level boundaries hypothesis’. Consequently, this index was calculated based on their respective scaling exponents. Although many different exponents have been reported in the literature, we considered the most applicable to be values that were phylogenetically corrected and included weighted means with random effects (i.e. 0.837 for ectotherms and 0.670 for endotherms)¹⁹. Moreover, these values for the scaling exponents align very closely with those based on field metabolic rates reported in the same paper. We also ran a sensitivity analysis to explore how different values for the scaling exponents observed in endotherms and ectotherms influenced our analysis. The scaling exponents used for this were based on a re-analysis of metabolic rates compiled from the literature⁵² and yielded similar results: when correcting for differences in metabolic scaling we never found different slopes for ectotherms and endotherms. Also, the model fitted a value for the oxygen index that was close to 1 (Table S1). The correlation structure of PGLS models reflects the potential similarity of species’ traits resulting from shared evolutionary history and an assumed model of residual trait evolution (e.g.,

342 see ⁵³⁻⁵⁵). These models can incorporate a transformation parameter that, in essence, stretches the
343 internal nodes of the tree either towards the tips of the tree (implying more phylogenetic signal in
344 the residual trait values) or towards the root of the tree (implying less phylogenetic signal in the
345 residuals). Given that we compare animals as different as turtles and diving beetles, accounting
346 for the influence of phylogeny is not straightforward. Therefore, we have considered different
347 transformation parameters and compared their goodness of fit (see Supplementary Materials; Fig.
348 S4). One such transformation parameter is Pagel's lambda (λ)⁵⁶. A value for lambda close to zero
349 indicates low phylogenetic signal (phylogenetic independence between species' residuals, or a
350 star phylogeny), whilst a value closer to one suggests that species' traits evolved randomly
351 through evolutionary timescales via a process similar to Brownian motion. It is also possible to
352 scale branches differently, depending on the position relative to the root by using Grafen's⁵⁷ rho
353 (ρ). For values of ρ near 0, branches near the tips are expanded, whilst for values above 1,
354 branches near the root are compressed, and vice versa. We constructed a topological tree for all
355 species in our dataset, drawing on published phylogenies⁵⁸⁻⁶² (Fig. 1) and added branch length
356 estimates using TimeTree⁶³. We then considered transformation effects of either Pagel's lambda
357 (λ) or Grafen's rho (ρ) and compared the goodness of fits (Table 1). Both transformation effects
358 had a clear optimum (Fig S4), which significantly improved upon the non-phylogenetic analysis
359 (λ) and the untransformed time calibrated tree ($\lambda=1$) (Table 1). We also considered Ornstein–
360 Uhlenbeck (OU) models, in the ape and nlme packages. Whilst these fitted the data ($\alpha =$
361 0.102) and gave parameter estimates similar to the best fitting model in Table 1, model support
362 was much lower (AIC = 182.48). This could result since it is unlikely that there is a single
363 attractor in our models: e.g. beetles and whales are unlikely to share a common optimal body
364 size. Whilst this could theoretically be solved by running OU models with multiple optima, this

would require good priors and may result in overfitting of the data. Consequently, we did not pursue this approach further. Finally, we fitted an additional model that excluded the effects of phylogeny: i.e. with $\lambda = 0$, which yields a star phylogeny and has one fewer parameter in the model.

All analyses were performed in R, using the packages *ape*, *picante*, *caper*. Residual plots (Figs. S5) were visually inspected for homoscedasticity, normality, and other assumptions. Effects of model variables are illustrated by means of partial residual plots using the package *visreg*. Partial residual plots illustrate the relationship between the independent variable and a given response variable whilst accounting for the effects of other independent variables in the model. Such plots are constructed by adding the residuals of the model to the fitted relationship of the independent variable of interest and plotting these values (on the y-axis) against the independent variable of interest (on the x-axis).

Acknowledgments

We thank Leela Chakravarti and Fanny Vermandele for their assistance with manuscript preparation.

Funding: This study was initiated whilst PC was an RCUK Research Fellow, and WCEPV a Marie-Curie Fellow with DTB at the University of Plymouth, and subsequently supported by intramural funding from Radboud University and Université du Québec à Rimouski. WCEPV is supported by a Marie Curie FP7 Integration Grant within the 7th European Union Framework Programme (FP7-PEOPLE-2012-CIG proposal N° 334048), PC by an NSERC Discovery Grant (RGPIN-2015-06500) and he is member of FRQNT-funded excellence research networks

Québec-Ocean and QCBS. TG Jr was supported by an NSF grant and FB is supported by the CNRS.

Author contributions: P.C. proposed the initial idea and together with D.T.B, J.I.S. and W.C.E.P.V. contributed to its development. F.B., P.C., and W.C.E.P.V. collated the data. W.C.E.P.V. led the data analysis with input from T.G. All authors discussed the results, and substantially contributed to the writing.

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

Data and materials availability: The dataset supporting this article have been uploaded to Dryad: <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.tqjq2bvv9>.

References

- 1 Butler PJ & Jones DR. The comparative physiology of diving vertebrates. *Adv. Comp. Physiol. Biol.* 8, 179-364 (1982).
- 2 Boyd IL. The behavioural and physiological ecology of diving. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 12, 213-217 (1997).
- 3 Schreer JF & Kovacs KM. Allometry of diving capacity in air-breathing vertebrates. *Can. J. Zool.* 75, 339-358 (1997).
- 4 Brischoux F, Gartner GEA, Garland T Jr & Bonnet A. Is aquatic life correlated with an increased hematocrit in snakes? *PLoS ONE* 6, e17077 (2011).
- 5 Mill PJ. Respiration: aquatic insects. *Physiology of the Insecta*, ed Rockstein M (Academic Press, New York), pp. 403-467 (1974).
- 6 Šamajová P & Gvoždík L. The influence of temperature on diving behaviour in the alpine newt, *Triturus alpestris*. *J. Therm. Biol.* 34, 401-405 (2009).

7. Houssaye, A. Bone histology of aquatic reptiles: what does it tell us about secondary adaptation to an aquatic life? *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* 108, 3-21 (2013).
- 8 Houston AI & Carbone C. The optimal allocation of time during the diving cycle. *Behav. Ecol.* 3, 255-265 (1992).
- 9 Kramer DL. The behavioral ecology of air breathing by aquatic animals. *Can. J. Zool.* 66, 89-94 (1988).
- 10 Halsey LG, Butler PJ & Blackburn TM. A phylogenetic analysis of the allometry of diving. *Am. Nat.* 167, 276-287 (2006).
- 11 Brischoux F, Bonnet X, Cook TR & Shine R. Allometry of diving capacities: ectothermy vs. endothermy. *J. Evol. Biol.* 21, 324-329 (2008).
12. Hayward A, Pajuelo M, Haase CG, Anderson DM & Gillooly JF. Common metabolic constraints on dive duration in endothermic and ectothermic vertebrates. *PeerJ* 4, e2569 (2016).
- 13 Halsey LG, Blackburn TM & Butler PJ. A comparative analysis of the diving behaviour of birds and mammals. *Funct. Ecol.* 20, 889-899 (2006).
- 14 Hayes JP & Garland T Jr. The evolution of endothermy: testing the aerobic capacity model. *Evolution.* 4, 836-847 (1995).
- 15 Clarke A & Pörtner H-O. Temperature, metabolic power and the evolution of endothermy. *Biol. Rev.* 85, 703-27 (2010).
16. Bennett, AF & Ruben JA. Endothermy and activity in vertebrates. *Science* 206, 649-654 (1979).
- 17 Calosi P, *et al.* The comparative biology of diving in two genera of European Dytiscidae (Coleoptera). *J. Evol. Biol.* 25, 329-341 (2012).

- 433 18 Sale A, *et al.* Long-term monitoring of leatherback turtle diving behaviour during oceanic
434 movements. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* 328, 197-210 (2006).
- 435 19 White CR, Cassey P & Blackburn TM. Allometric exponents do not support a universal
436 metabolic allometry. *Ecology* 88, 315-323 (2007).
- 437 20 Garland T Jr, & Albuquerque RL. Locomotion, energetics, performance, and behavior: a
438 mammalian perspective on lizards, and vice versa. *Int. Comp. Biol.* 57, 252-266 (2017).
- 439 21 Glazier DS. Beyond the '3/4-power law': variation in the intra- and interspecific scaling of
440 metabolic rate in animals. *Biol. Rev.* 80, 611-662 (2005).
- 441 22 Glazier, DS. A unifying explanation for diverse metabolic scaling in animals and plants. *Biol.*
442 *Rev.* 85, 111-138 (2010).
- 443 23 Brown JH, Gillooly JF, Allen AP, Savage VM & West GB. Toward a metabolic theory of
444 ecology. *Ecology* 85, 1771-1789 (2004).
- 445 24 Mirceta S, *et al.* Evolution of mammalian diving capacity traced by myoglobin net surface
446 charge. *Science* **340**, 1234192 (2013).
- 447 25 Goldbogen JA, Calambokidis J, Croll DA, McKenna MF, Oleson E, Potvin J, Pyenson ND,
448 Schorr G, Shadwick RE & Tersch BR. Scaling of lunge-feeding performance in rorqual
449 whales: mass-specific energy expenditure increases with body size and progressively limits
450 diving capacity. *Funct. Ecol.* **26**, 216-226 (2012).
- 451 26 Gillooly JF, Charnov EL, West GB, Savage VM & Brown JH. Effects of size and temperature
452 on metabolic rate. *Science* **293**, 2248-2251 (2001).
- 453 27 White CR, Phillips NF & Seymour RS. The scaling and temperature dependence of vertebrate
454 metabolism. *Biol. Lett.* 2, 125-127 (2006).

- 28 Phillipson J. Bioenergetic options and phylogeny. *Physiological Ecology: An Evolutionary Approach to Resource Use*, eds Townsend CR, Calow P (Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA), pp. 20-45 (1981).
- 29 Dejours P. Principles of Comparative Respiratory Physiology. Elsevier, Amsterdam (1981).
- 30 Verberk WCEP & Atkinson D. Why polar gigantism and Palaeozoic gigantism are not equivalent: effects of oxygen and temperature on the body size of ectotherms. *Funct. Ecol.* 27, 1275-1285 (2013).
- 31 Heim, NA, Knope ML, Schaal, EK, Wang SC & Payne JL. Cope's rule in the evolution of marine animals. *Science* 347, 867-870 (2015).
- 32 Nakajima Y, Houssaye, A & Endo H. Osteohistology of the Early Triassic ichthyopterygian reptile *Utatsusaurus hataii*: Implications for early ichthyosaur biology. *Acta Palaeo. Polonica* 59, 343–352 (2014).
- 33 Fleischle CV, Wintrich T & Sander PM. Quantitative histological models suggest endothermy in plesiosaurs. *PeerJ* 6, e4955 (2018).
- 34 Lindgren J., *et al.* Soft-tissue evidence for homeothermy and crypsis in a Jurassic ichthyosaur. *Nature* 564, 359-365 (2018).
- 35 Bernard A, *et al.* Regulation of body temperature by some Mesozoic marine reptiles. *Science* 328, 1379-1382 (2010).
- 36 Harrell TJ Jr, Perez-Huerta A & Suarez CA. Endothermic mosasaurs? Possible thermoregulation of late cretaceous mosasaurs (Reptilia, Squamata) indicated by stable oxygen isotopes in fossil bioapatite in comparison with coeval marine fish and pelagic seabirds. *Palaeontology* 59, 351-363 (2016).

- 477 37 Nespolo RF, Bacigalupe LD, Figueroa CC, Koteja P & Opazo JC. Using new tools to solve
478 an old problem: the evolution of endothermy in vertebrates. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 26, 414-423
479 (2011).
- 480 38 O’Gorman JP, Talevi M & Fernandez MS. Osteology of a perinatal aristonectine
481 (Plesiosauria; Elasmosauridae). *Antarctic Sci.* 29, 61–72 (2017).
- 482 39 Thorne PM, Ruta M & Benton MJ. Resetting the evolution of marine reptiles at the Triassic-
483 Jurassic boundary. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* 108, 8339–8344 (2011).
- 484 40 Ferróna HG & Martínez-Pérez C, Botella H The evolution of gigantism in active marine
485 predators. *Hist. Biol.* 30, 712-716 (2018).
- 486 41 O’Keefe FR, Carrano MT. Correlated trends in the evolution of the plesiosaur locomotor
487 system. *Paleobiology* 31, 656–675 (2005).
- 488 42 Polcyn MJ, Jacobs LL, Araújo R, Schulp AS, & Mateus O. Physical drivers of mosasaur
489 evolution. *Palaeogeogr., Palaeoclim., Palaeoecol.* 400, 17-27 (2014).
- 490 43 Garland T Jr & Carter PA. Evolutionary physiology. *Ann. Rev. Physiol.* 56, 579–621 (1994).
- 491 44 Feder ME, Bennett AF & Huey RB. Evolutionary physiology. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Sys.* 31, 315–
492 341 (2000).
- 493 45 Ropert-Coudert Y, Kato A, Robbins A, Humphries GRW. The Penguiness book. World Wide
494 Web electronic publication (<http://www.penguiness.net>), version 3.0, October 2018.
495 DOI:10.13140/RG.2.2.32289.66406
- 496 46 Gaines SD & Denny MW. The largest, smallest, highest, lowest, longest, and shortest:
497 Extremes in Ecology. *Ecology* 74, 1677-1692 (1993).

- 47 Storch S, Wilson RP, Hillis-Starr ZM & Adelung D. Cold-blooded divers: temperature-dependent dive performance in the wild hawksbill turtle *Eretmochelys imbricata*. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 293, 263–271 (2005).
- 48 Seebacher F, Franklin CE & Read M. Diving behaviour of a reptile (*Crocodylus johnstoni*) in the wild: Interactions with heart rate and body temperature. *Physiol. Biochem. Zool.* 78, 1–8 (2005).
- 49 Priest T. Bimodal respiration and dive behaviour of the Fitzroy river turtle, *Rheodytes leukops*. BSc thesis, University of Queensland, Brisbane (1997).
- 50 Clarke A, Johnston NM Scaling of metabolic rate with body mass and temperature in teleost fish. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 68, 893–905 (1999).
- 51 Millar JS & Hickling GJ. Fasting endurance and the evolution of mammalian body size. *Funct. Ecol.* 4, 5–12 (1990).
52. White CR, Marshall DJ, Alton LA, *et al.* The origin and maintenance of metabolic allometry in animals. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 3: 598–603 (2019).
53. Garland T Jr, Bennett AF & Rezende EL. Phylogenetic approaches in comparative physiology. *J. Exp. Biol.* 208, 3015–3035 (2005).
54. Rezende EL & Diniz-Filho JAF. Phylogenetic analyses: comparing species to infer adaptations and physiological mechanisms. *Comp. Physiol.* 2, 639–674 (2012).
55. Huey RB, Garland T Jr, & Turelli M. Revisiting a key innovation in evolutionary biology: Felsenstein's 'Phylogenies and the Comparative Method.' *Am. Nat.* 193, 755–772 (2019).
56. Pagel M. Detecting correlated evolution on phylogenies: a general method for the comparative analysis of discrete characters. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 255: 37–45 (1994).

57. Grafen A. The phylogenetic regression. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B. Biol. Sci.* 326: 119-157 (1989).
58. Fulton, TL & Strobeck, C. Molecular phylogeny of the Arctoidea (Carnivora): Effect of missing data on supertree and supermatrix analyses of multiple gene data sets. *Mol. Phylogen. Evol.* 41, 165–181 (2006).
- 59 Higdon, JW, Bininda-Emonds, ORP, Beck RMD & SH Ferguson. Phylogeny and divergence of the pinnipeds (Carnivora: Mammalia) assessed using a multigene dataset. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 7, 216 (2007).
60. Lu B, Yang W, Dai Q, Fu J. Using genes as characters and a parsimony analysis to explore the phylogenetic position of turtles. *PLoS ONE* 8, e79348 (2013).
61. Lyson TR, Bever GS, Bhullar B-A S, Joyce WG, & Gauthier JA. Transitional fossils and the origin of turtles. *Biol. Lett.* 6, 830–833 (2010).
- 62 Smith ND. Phylogenetic Analysis of Pelecaniformes (Aves) based on osteological data: Implications for waterbird phylogeny and fossil calibration studies. *PLoS ONE* 5, e13354 (2010).
- 63 Kumar S, Stecher G, Suleski M, Hedges SB. TimeTree: A resource for timelines, timetrees, and divergence times. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 34, 1812-1819 (2017).

Supplementary Materials:

Supplementary analysis: differences in metabolic scaling exponent between ectotherms and endotherms.

Sensitivity analyses: sensitivity to: 1) different scaling exponents; 2) different activation energies; 3) different transformations of the phylogenetic tree.

Figures S1-S4

Tables S1, S2

Image credits

546






Fig. 1. Phylogenetic tree of all species (N=226) used in the analyses, displaying maximum dive duration (length of outer bars) and body mass (gradient in branch colours). Outer bars are colour coded to represent Reptiles (purple), Mammals (green), Insects (orange), Birds (red) and Amphibians (blue). For image credits see supplementary materials.



555 **Fig. 2.** Plots with all the data on maximum dive duration, colour coded for different groups of
556 animals (A), with 95% prediction intervals shown separately for ectotherms (in blue) and
557 endotherms (in red). Partial residual plots show how maximum dive duration (min) changes with
558 body mass (kg) (B), the index of oxygen storage capacity (C), and temperature (D), whereby
559 species are colour coded according to being ectotherms (blue) or endotherms (red). Note the
560 \log_{10} transformation for Dive duration, Body mass and the Oxygen index. Linear regression
561 equations are given in each plot (full details on the parameters can be found in Table 1). Partial
562 residual plots illustrate the relationship between the response variable (here maximum dive
563 duration) and a given independent variable whilst accounting for the effects of other independent
564 variables in the model. Hence variation in dive duration owing to differences in temperature is
565 accounted for in plot B and C, isolating the effects of body mass and the oxygen index
566 respectively, whereas plot D isolates the effects of temperature by accounting for differences in
567 body mass. For image credits see supplementary materials.

Table 1. Summary of phylogenetic generalized least squares (PGLS) models to explain variation in maximum dive duration (log-transformed). Models employed either body mass (log-transformed) directly (model A), or an oxygen index based on body mass (models B and C; see Methods). In addition, models A and B included an interaction between metabolic mode and body mass or the oxygen index. All models also included the effect of temperature, expressed as the effect temperature has on oxygen demand (see Fig. S3), so that higher values indicate higher metabolic demand and hence reduced dive duration (see methods). Each model was analysed with a tree topology based on either a star phylogeny (thus defaulting to an OLS analysis), a tree with branch lengths estimated as divergence times, employing either no transformations, a transformation based on an optimal value for Pagel's lambda (λ) or Grafen's rho (ρ) (see Fig. S4). Parameter estimates are given with the standard error in brackets. AIC is the Akaike Information Criterion, with lower values indicating better fit of the model to the data. BIC is the Bayesian Information Criterion.

577
578

A. Maximum dive duration ~ Body mass + Metabolic mode + Temperature + Body mass x Metabolic mode

tree topology	star ($\lambda=0$)		time-calibrated branch lengths (no branchlength transformations)		Optimal Lambda ($\lambda=0.95$)		Optimal Rho ($\rho = 0.273$)	
	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value
Intercept: ectothermy	2.405 (± 0.160)	<0.0001	2.859 (± 1.968)	0.1477	2.009 (± 0.688)	0.0038	2.117 (± 0.257)	<0.0001
Body mass: ectothermy	0.197 (± 0.021)	<0.0001	0.3106 (± 0.198)	0.1183	0.124 (± 0.102)	0.2283	0.158 (± 0.054)	0.0039
Metabolic mode: endothermy	-0.864 (± 0.227)	0.0002	-0.179 (± 1.312)	0.8918	-0.823 (± 0.483)	0.0895	-0.968 (± 0.321)	0.0029
Temperature	-1.068 (± 0.261)	0.0001	-1.938 (± 0.441)	<0.0001	-0.993 (± 0.328)	0.0027	-0.863 (± 0.289)	0.0031
Body mass x Metabolic mode: endothermy	0.105 (± 0.041)	0.0108	0.016 (± 0.214)	0.9397	0.207 (± 0.112)	0.0663	0.167 (± 0.072)	0.0218
Log likelihood	-111.9802		-164.6335		-72.33608		-66.42	

AIC	235.96		341.27		158.67		144.84	
BIC	256.35		361.66		182.46		165.23	
B. Maximum dive duration ~ O2 index (M^0.163 for ectotherms; M^0.330 for endotherms) + Metabolic mode + Temperature + O2 index x Metabolic mode								
tree topology	star ($\lambda=0$)		time-calibrated branch lengths (no branchlength transformations)		Optimal Lambda ($\lambda=0.95$)		Optimal Rho ($\rho = 0.273$)	
	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value
Intercept: ectothermy	2.4045 (\pm 0.160)	<0.0001	2.859 (\pm 1.968)	0.1477	2.009 (\pm 0.688)	0.0038	2.117 (\pm 0.257)	<0.0001
O2 index: ectothermy	1.211 (\pm 0.131)	<0.0001	1.906 (\pm 1.216)	0.1183	0.760 (\pm 0.620)	0.2283	0.967 (\pm 0.331)	0.0039
Metabolic mode:endothermy	-0.864 (\pm 0.227)	0.0002	-0.179 (\pm 1.312)	0.8918	-0.823 (\pm 0.483)	0.0895	-0.968 (\pm 0.321)	0.0029
Temperature	-1.068 (\pm 0.261)	0.0001	-1.938 (\pm 0.441)	<0.0001	-0.993 (\pm 0.328)	0.0027	-0.863 (\pm 0.289)	0.0031
O2 index x Metabolic mode: endothermy	-0.296 (\pm 0.178)	0.0984	0.915 (\pm 1.241)	0.4614	0.244 (\pm 0.646)	0.7062	0.015 (\pm 0.365)	0.9665
Log likelihood	-109.06		-161.71		-69.41		-63.5	
AIC	230.12		335.42		152.83		139.00	
BIC	250.5		355.81		176.61		159.39	
C. Maximum dive duration ~ O2 index (M^0.163 for ectotherms; M^0.330 for endotherms) + Metabolic mode + Temperature								
tree topology	star ($\lambda=0$)		time-calibrated branch lengths (no branchlength transformations)		Optimal Lambda ($\lambda=0.95$)		Optimal Rho ($\rho = 0.273$)	
	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value	Estimate (\pm SE)	P-value
Intercept: ectothermy	2.199 (\pm 0.102)	<0.0001	2.461 (\pm 1.890)	0.1944	2.118 (\pm 0.617)	0.0007	2.122 (\pm 0.226)	<0.0001
O2 index	1.018 (\pm 0.062)	<0.0001	1.025 (\pm 0.229)	<0.0001	0.992 (\pm 0.125)	<0.0001	0.980 (\pm 0.122)	<0.0001
Metabolic mode:endothermy	-1.067 (\pm 0.192)	<0.0001	-0.157 (\pm 1.310)	0.9045	-0.820 (\pm 0.478)	0.0879	-0.967 (\pm 0.320)	0.0028
Temperature	-0.782 (\pm 0.197)	0.0001	-1.889 (\pm 0.435)	<0.0001	-1.018 (\pm 0.320)	0.0017	-0.866 (\pm 0.279)	0.0022
Log likelihood	-109.63		-163.12		-69.96		-63.41	
AIC	229.25		353.25		151.92		136.82	
BIC	246.27		336.24		172.34		153.83	